

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, rejected claims 1-3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), rejected claims 4-6, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 and objected to claims 9-13 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

As indicated above, claim 1 has been amended in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter to which the Applicants regard as the invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1-2 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph.

As indicated above, claims 1 and 3 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 1 claims an armature of a rotating electric machine, the armature comprising a plurality of first and second magnetic teeth. The plurality of first magnetic teeth are arranged side by side along a circumferential direction of the rotating electric machine. Each of the first magnetic teeth have a yoke portion extending along the circumferential direction, and a tooth portion extending from a central part of the yoke portion inward along a radial direction of the rotating electric machine. End surfaces of the yoke portions of two adjacent magnetic teeth are positioned directly face to face with one another. Each of the second magnetic teeth is located between tooth portions of each successive pair of adjacent first magnetic teeth. Each of the second magnetic teeth directly joins together the end surface of

the yoke portions of the two adjacent first magnetic teeth located on both sides thereof.

Through the structure of the claimed invention having first and second magnetic teeth, each of the second magnetic teeth directly joining together end surfaces of the yoke portions of two adjacent first magnetic teeth located on both sides thereof, as claimed in claim 1, the claimed invention provides an armature of a rotating electric machine having a reduced number of manufacturing steps, and will neither deform nor cause deterioration due to deformation of the armature. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 1.

Claim 3 claims an armature of a rotating electric machine, the armature comprising a plurality of first magnetic teeth arranged side by side along a circumferential direction of the rotating electric machine, and a plurality of second magnetic teeth joined to the first magnetic teeth. Each of the first magnetic teeth have a yoke portion extending along the circumferential direction, a tooth portion extending from a central part of the yoke portion inward along a radial direction of the rotating electric machine, and a pair of joint portions formed along inner edges of both end surfaces of the yoke portion. The joint portions formed at the facing end surfaces of the yoke portions of each successive pair of adjacent first magnetic teeth together forming a connecting part. End surfaces of the yoke portions of the adjacent magnetic teeth are positioned directly face to face with one another. Each of the second magnetic teeth extends along the radial direction with a mating part formed at an outer end surface of each second magnetic tooth. Each second magnetic tooth is directly joining together the end surface of the yoke portion of two

adjacent first magnetic teeth by fitting the connecting part of the two adjacent magnetic teeth to the mating part.

Through the structure of the claimed invention having first and second magnetic teeth, where each second magnetic tooth directly joins together the end surfaces of two adjacent first magnetic teeth by fitting the connecting part of the two adjacent first magnetic teeth to the mating part of the second magnetic tooth, as claimed in claim 3, the claimed invention provides an armature of a rotating electric machine having a reduced number of manufacturing steps and which neither deforms nor causes deterioration of properties of the rotating electric machine due to deformation of the armature. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 3.

Claims 1-3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Yasuhara et al.* (Japanese Reference 09-009534).

Yasuhara et al. appears to disclose a stator core 3A composing two types of elements, i.e, core pieces 31 and rod-shaped core pieces 32 provided between the core pieces 31. As slots 3C in which stator coils are laid are formed between the teeth of the rod-shaped core pieces 32 and the teeth of the core pieces 31 when the respective rod-shaped core pieces 32 are inserted between the respective core pieces 31 in radial direction and the stator coils are housed in the slots 3C. With this constitution, unlike with a conventional constitution, it is not necessary to push stator coils into slots, so that a number of stator coil conductors can be housed in one slot.
(abstract)

Thus, *Yasuhara et al.* merely discloses rod-shaped core pieces 32 inserted between respective core pieces 31. Nothing in *Yasuhara et al.* shows, teaches or

suggests each second magnetic tooth directly joins together end surfaces of the yoke portions of two adjacent first magnetic teeth as claimed in claims 1 and 3.

Rather, core pieces 32 are inserted between core pieces 31, and thus separate the pieces 31 from one another.

Additionally, *Yasuhara et al.* merely discloses inserting core piece 32 between core pieces 31. Nothing in *Yasuhara et al.* shows, teaches or suggests that each second magnetic tooth directly joins together two adjacent first magnetic teeth by fitting the connecting part of the two adjacent first magnetic teeth to a mating part, where the joint portions are formed at the facing end surface of the yoke portions of each successive pair of adjacent first magnetic teeth and the mating portion is formed at an outer end surface of each second magnetic tooth as claimed in claim 3. Rather, *Yasuhara et al.* merely discloses inserting core piece 32 between core pieces 31.

Since nothing in *Yasuhara et al.* shows, teaches or suggests a) each second magnetic tooth directly joining together end surfaces of the yoke portions of two adjacent first magnetic teeth located on both sides thereof as claimed in claims 1 and 3 or b) each second magnetic tooth directly joins together two adjacent first magnetic teeth by fitting the connecting part of the two adjacent first magnetic teeth to the mating part of the second magnetic tooth as claimed in claim 3, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 2 and 7 depend from claims 1 and 3 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 and 7 would not have been anticipated by *Yasuhara et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) at least for the reasons

as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 4-6 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Yasuhara et al.* in view *Nishiyama et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,480). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Yasuhara et al.* in view of *Mueller* (U.S. Patent No. 5,909,072).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, since nothing in *Yasuhara et al.* shows, teaches or suggests the primary features as claimed in claims 1 and 3, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the primary reference with the secondary reference to *Nishiyama et al.* or *Mueller et al.* will not overcome the deficiencies of the primary reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 4-6, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Since objected to claims 9-13 depend from allowable claims, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the objection thereto.

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination do not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 13, 2005

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Registration No. 32,131

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620